

and in places like San Diego you are looking at \$1,000, \$1,200 a month for the smallest amounts. So we have some major problems to fix, and that means money.

Mr. BUYER. The gentleman is bringing a defense bill to the floor next week. What are the major themes of that defense bill?

Mr. HUNTER. We are going to try to do a lot of things with what we have, with the \$18 billion in extra spending that we anticipate this year above and beyond what we call the "Clinton baseline." But that \$18 billion, once again, does not come close to solving the equipment problem, which is about a \$30-billion-per-year problem, solving the ammunition problems, the people problems, the other problems we have across the board. We are going to do as much as we can.

#### CRITICAL ISSUES AFFECTING WOMEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KIRK). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I have come tonight to reflect upon some of the issues that I was confronted with over this August recess with many women whom I spoke with, and they simply wanted to know what we were doing in this House and this administration in trying to address some of the critical issues that are affecting women today. As we know, the women of today and tomorrow will be the majority of the workforce and thereby need to have the necessary tools with which they can provide for their families and themselves.

As I talked with these women, they were really concerned about reproductive rights. They want to make sure that this House does not whittle away the rights that they should have to look into whether they will provide for their children, whether they will have the right to their own lives, to their own bodies; and they simply want to make sure that this House does not do anything that would be destructive to the rights of women in terms of their reproductive rights.

Domestic violence is another one that they have talked with me about, because they simply look at the number of women and children who are now on the streets, the streets across this Nation, the most powerful Nation on Earth, not giving the women, again, tools to provide for their families and themselves, giving them the job training that they need so that they can sustain themselves and their families, giving their children the type of education that is needed to provide them the type of future that is required for the workforce.

Mr. Speaker, we must simply look at the agenda that this Congress is bringing forth for women and their families, as well as this administration. We can

really leave no family behind, as we talk about leaving no child behind.

So as I come tonight, I just want the American people to know that I will be here every week now trying to synthesize and look through the myriad of issues that we have here on this floor, to see whether or not we really are serious about leaving no child behind and ensuring that the women of today will be sufficiently prepared for the workforce tomorrow and for today.

So beginning this month-long effort, we want to look at the wellness of women and their families. We want to look into the public policy to find out whether or not this administration is serious about leaving no child behind. As we look at that, we simply look at the education proposal that has been put forth.

We do not have the money to talk about the class sizes that the urban areas and the rural areas look at in terms of their children's quality of health and quality of education. This budget does not speak to reducing class sizes. It does not speak to qualified teachers that will be teachers who are making the salary conducive to teaching our children. It does not speak to the construction of schools that will provide the proper type of environment for our children.

This education proposal that the President has put through will leave children behind if he does not put the type of financial support behind these words and this slogan. It will be an empty slogan if the money does not follow the message.

So if we are talking about leaving no child behind, especially in my district of Watts and Compton and Wilmington, where you have the most impoverished kids, you have to make sure title I has the type of funding that is necessary to bring these children forward, the type of classrooms that will teach them high technology, the type of qualified teachers that will be there to teach them and to have a type of constructive engagement that will help them through their period of schooling. Healthy Start and Head Start need to have financial support.

I will be looking very carefully at this education proposal, looking at the President when he speaks about leaving no child behind, to make sure that we have sufficient funding for math and science for girls, because as I have gone around this Nation over this last month, I have found that there is a considerably decreasing number of girls in math and science classes. We are not encouraging our girls to go into math and science, and yet these are the future engineers and scientists who will be speaking to and doing research on the quality of life for families. So that is one element that we need to look at. The other thing is that of health.

Mr. Speaker, I will simply say, I will be here every week to speak on health, education and the quality of life for women and their families.

#### FOREIGN POLICY AND OUR NATIONAL SECURITY OBJECTIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CANTOR). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, earlier the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) and I spoke on the issues of national security. I want to touch on an issue we do not really talk about much on the House floor, and it is the issue of foreign policy and how it relates to our national security objectives, i.e., our military strategy to fight and win our Nation's wars, as the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) likes to refer to, with overwhelming force.

We went through the 8 years of the Clinton administration and we had a foreign policy of engagement. The President has the responsibility of outlining what are the vital interests of a Nation. Then he turns to the Pentagon and says what is your military strategy now to protect the interests of a Nation that I have outlined?

President Clinton, what he had done in his foreign policy of engagement, took 275,000 of America's finest and spread them over 135 nations all around the world. What that did was create an expectancy by our allies and our friends that the United States will always be there. So when you looked at Germany, or the United Kingdom, other allies began to decrease their defense budgets relative to their GNP.

Time out. You are going the wrong way. So now we have had a change in administrations and a change in direction, so I give some counsel now unto the administration: when the United States has provided for the peace and the stability of two major regions of the world, the Pacific Rim and Europe, I believe the United States as a superpower, we can act. Whether it is unilaterally or in concert with another nation, if there is instability upon a region of the world, then we can act.

Take, for example, the continent of Europe. If there is an intercontinental conflict that poses no threat to destabilize the region, then our allies need to step up to the plate. We can provide assistance through our architecture of intelligence or through our airlift and our sealift, but we need to ask of our allies that they begin to accept greater burdens of peace and responsibility.

Now to the issue of our military force structure and how that relates to that foreign policy. There is a debate in the town about do we move away from the military strategy of being able to fight and win two nearly simultaneous major regional conflicts. I have never endorsed that two-major-regional-conflict scenario, but I think what is important and what I have heard the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) say is it is in our interests, this Nation of ours, to not only protect our interests and that of our allies; when they need our assistance, we need to be